



ALANTHA O
ABEY QUIDDITCH
PHOTOGRAPHY O

Photo: Alantha Abey Quidditch Photography



**QUIDDITCH
AUSTRALIA**

QA Meeting Minutes

April Board Meeting



Quidditch Australia's April Meeting

Minutes

Date: 19. 04. 2020

Location: Google Hangouts

Present: Ajantha Abey, Kelsey Collins, Alistair Yap, Jamie Turbet, Nicola Gertler, Luke Derrick, Scott Palmer

Meeting Opened: 6:04pm

World Cup

What do we do with the team?

NG: I'd like to step back on determining how we are going to go about this, I agree with AJ's points, in regard to potential bias, whether inherent or intentional. I think myself and Luke have a lot of experience with this in regard to how to research and brainstorm options, and then remove ourselves from the discussion when it comes time to make a decision. This is different from a complaint. Rather than us discussing what we should do, we should research what to do..

LD: I need to stop you there as this is your opinion.

NG: I am not sure if this is

LD: Jamie?

JT: Yes, I think so.

LD: I have opinions, but I have expressed myself in management, so not sure either way if I should participate or not.

JT: The process from here, as outlined in the constitution, is for the board member to state they have a bias, which has happened, and to state if they would like to participate in the discussion and why. Now we need to decide if they should via a vote.



NG: Does anyone have questions about potential bias? We have lots of steps, we are discussing how to determine what we do, and then a separate discussion regarding the final decision.

AJ: I think the 5 of us need a discussion about if we want them involved in the discussion and in what capacity.

Luke Derrick hands chair of the meeting over to Jamie Turbet 6:15pm

Nicola Gertler and Luke Derrick left the meeting at 6:15pm

JT: Ok, we need to decide if they should participate in research, and then in decision making. Does anyone want to start discussion?

AJ: I think they should help us in how to approach situation, then the 5 of us come back to make a decision

KC: I think it is fine for research, but not for final decisions

AJ: We start having the brainstorming discussion now to express anything that we would like

KC: Start brainstorming with them, and then remove.

AJ: Good opportunity to say anything now if we would like to

JT: Ok, lets go to a vote

Should Luke Derrick and Nicola Gertler be involved with the research aspect of how to proceed with the national team?

Yes: 5

No: 0

Abstain: 0

JT: Ok, now lets move on and discuss if they should be involved in decision making

KC: They can give ideas about how to move forward, but not opinions



AJ: That's a bit of a grey area there

JT: They should aim to be presenting their information in unopiniated ways, and explain why they are presenting the ideas they are

AJ: I agree they should not to have a vote, but it's hard to not be opinionated

KC: There is also the concern of the public view of bias, rather than the actual bias. It doesn't matter who or what, we need to prove our trustworthiness from a public perspective

JT: Ok, lets vote on if we think Nicola and Luke can vote or present opinions

Throughout this process Luke Derrick and Nicola Gertler cannot express ideas from a personal perspective, nor be involved in final decision making or voting.

Yes: 5

No: 0

Abstain: 0

Nicola Gertler and Luke Derrick return 6:25pm

JT: We have decided that you both can participate in the research aspect of this process, but cannot be involved in the final decision, nor vote. When presenting research it must be presented neutrally and not give your own opinions at any point.

NG: That is going to be difficult

KC: Just make sure you are not saying stuff like 'I we should do this'. Always present why you are including something in your research.

NG: If you think we are presenting an opinion, please ask us for clarification with ideas presented.

Jamie Turbet hands back chair to Luke Derrick 6:28pm



AJ: What are our main values when trying to make our decision?

LD: Jamie, what did the management team say?

JT: In terms of values, their biggest concerns seemed to be the best use of our resources and to get the best team to the US

LD: We said something about making the team a group of 30, possibly taking in extra people who can now attend. Sort of moving into what the US does with a standing team. We agreed reselecting the team entirely was a waste of time.

NG: I have a few points that move back from what we are talking about - we are talking about outcome but we should talk about principles and research. Whatever happens, our timeframe is the main thing to consider. In regard to determining time frame, with potential time for selecting and training (not including covid) looking at long term process for potential national standing squads, not 21, but 42, talent pool, other national groups. Taking this opportunity to look at this process would be beneficial

Fairness and talent identification are two aspects of fairness we should consider - you have a group of people who have a lot of financial and training commitments, and you also have people who didn't make it or didn't try out because they weren't in a financial position to go, but can now/in 2021. Two different things to consider. If WC isn't going to be held till 2024, it's very disheartening for the community for an opportunity for this team as the next one will be far away. There is the aspect of people who are motivated to try for next time, but not everyone will be motivated for 4 years. Idea of fairness for applicants and current team.

Talent identification goes into a long term process, submitting videos, looking at coaches. We don't have that sort of staff but we could try and look at doing that if we get a national process up to a high level.

We are making the assumption that all current players are going to want to attend 2021, we should get a survey from everyone asking for eligibility.



We had a lot of scrutiny in lack of team input, mainly over controversy over a selector, but we should consult team representatives to generate ideas. This is a good opportunity for bridging the problem.

For selecting the team, we need to consider selection and staff responsibility to assist with the selection process. This would be a great opportunity to get volunteers involved in the process.

We should step back from the conversation, but I think there's so much more to do and consider before we come to a decision

KC: We have a unique opportunity to bring our processes in line with more successful countries/sports. We should start with what other countries are doing.

NG: With the national talent identification process, our time frames are always so short and things don't seem fair, but things are always so rushed. Could help longterm get people involved into staff and coaching roles.

AJ: I like your points as well, arguments about fairness are good. We should also consider the fairness to the community who expect the Dropbears to be a representative national team that best represents them. We should have always been working on hiring further assistant coaches. Good opportunity to open applications again. We lose players from the team, there will have to be some reselection along the way. Long term strategy is good, but perhaps not for now as we don't really know how much time we will have once we all get out of isolation.

NG: Whatever we decide it will be dependent on how much time we have. I have a point in regard to fairness, one thing you could consider to the people who have already made the team, we could say that the currently selected team won't go below the development squad. Not sure how that would work with numbers. We don't want to eliminate people who have already put in effort into the process.

AJ: That does make sense to me.

JT: Paul has seemed reluctant to bring large numbers as it is not manageable

AJ: Numbers should go to the management team anyway

LD: Does anyone else have something to say? Alistair, Scott?



AY: I agree with recognising people have put in a lot of effort into the team, this is completely unprecedented, we should honour commitments people have made. Looking for more people into the squad, do we do a complete reselection off the cards?

AJ: Unless a large portion of the current team cannot attend 2021.

KC: In terms of a complete reselection, it should be an option we consider. Even if we completely dismiss it, it should still be looked into.

LD: Are we currently deciding what options we take, are we taking this to team reps/states etc.

AJ: I think we are coming up with what the options are and then going for a survey

SP: Give them a chance to have an input now due to past issues

NG: For further discussion with dropbears staff we need to put forward our guiding principles, ask for what is important to them. Scott do you disagree with anything?

SP: I think I do agree with all the points raised. We've got to be fair to the people who have already committed, writing them off is the last thing we should do.

LD: There's a lot to discuss, we should figure out what we want to ask people?

AJ: We should ask for the options; complete reselection, no reselection, people retain some spot in the squad, those who cannot make it drops out, we allow some sort of application system to some selection body, how we run applications and timeframes from training squad to final team

LD: Middle option would be hard to work out word from word. Offer 3 options - figure out the wording in a document

AJ: Is there something we haven't considered

AY: That seems fine

LD: If everyone's happy with that Jamie will make a document

NG: Doing some research into what others are doing would be valuable

LD: Jamie will make a document, publish it on Wednesday. This should also ask what we do for staff

Actionables: Jamie to make a document with options in regards to how to proceed with the national team.



What to do with the campaign?

AJ: Campaign wise, for everyone who has already made the team are we giving everyone a jersey, or only the new team? When do we start the campaign? There are advantages to having a long campaign, but we could forget about it

KC: We should have a longer campaign, but not now, see what's happening. Start when quidditch resumes

AJ: Merch wise, nothing is changing.

LD: We need to announce what we will do.

JT: Could be beneficial to start a little sooner than when we start training to keep people engaged with the sport

AJ: Yeah, but also people's financial situation may not be in the position to support the campaign

KC: Could we do snippets?

AJ: We wouldn't want to release jersey designs now, and then not release sales for a long time is bad. Assuming we are having the same designs and stuff, can we start putting in orders before we ask for money?

KC: Can we have an EOI deal?

NG: We need to pay for everything we order upfront, we do not have the money to spend buying up merch

Scott leaves 7:00pm

AJ: From a promotional perspective, having photos in merch and jerseys is powerful, so we

Luke Derrick leaves the meeting and gives chair to Jamie Turbet 7:12pm

NG: If anyone is concerned with bias from myself, please express your concerns so I can better express myself



KC: Yes, that should always be the case, regardless of who or what it is

Deadly Sports Plus Concussion Workshop

JT: Nic will be holding a concussion workshop, we need to decide if we will be paying for anyone.

NG: How much pp?

JT: \$15

NG: We get about \$30 from memberships, it would come from 50% of an individual's contribution. Do we want it to be the team management people?

KC: We should subsidise one person per team, and allow everyone to attend

JT: We charge team fee. Does that go anywhere, or just income?

NG: Nope, just income, we could send two to three

JT: If we make it compulsory we should pay for at least one person to attend, not fair otherwise

KC: We should it make compulsory for teams, a part of QUAFL eligibility.

NG: I don't mind two people per team, spreads the load, so at least one person can attend QUAFL with this training

KC: Two is fine

KC: Minimum one person per team should go through training for QUAFL.

AY: Need to add this to gameplay document

Luke Derrick reenters the meeting and Jamie Turbet hands chari back to Luke at 7:20pm

AY: Do they need qualifications to attend?

JT: No



NSO Recognition

AJ: We wanted it to be a time to get NSO stuff done, we should get the ball rolling

LD: Good point. What's happened?

JT: Been a bit slow, but since we now have a draft strategic plan things are picking up again. Nora has made it clear she wants board members involved, it will become clear how everyone gets involved once everyone starts working again

KC: Get her to communicate what she wants to us and we will do anything we can to help

AJ: We need to have well defined roles between the work group and the board

HR Management

AJ: I want a HR manager and coordinator, a dedicated person to put procedures and documents in place, reporting, and onputing people, getting them set up with emails and everything. Need a person dedicated to this to keep everyone moving and engaged.

NG: Sounds great

LD: Lets get this advertised ASAP

Financial Report

NG: We currently have:

PayPal: \$4,794.72 AUD

Commbank:\$25,545.71

Total:\$30,339.89

Expected income: None

We processed 6 refunds.

JT: Do we have expected expenses?



NG: Insurance will be the start in June/July. If we can't play we will just do public liability. Only possible is dropbears or media, and the concussion education workshop.

Complaint Management

JT: Having seen how teams are operating and handling complaints, I am realising most don't seem to understand correct procedures and legal obligations. I would like to introduce mandatory training that ALL people managing a team has to complete. I have found something that is 15 minutes of reading, watching and answering questions. I would like this to be another requirement for teams wanting to go to QUAFL, and after this year they need to have it to register a team. I understand this seems harsh, but this is a very serious matter and putting this in place will help ensure the protection of our members.

AJ: Going forward, what about people who get elected throughout the year?

LD: They need to complete it three weeks from when they get elected

AY: Should we also move this to event sanctioning?

LD: How long does this last?

JT: Two years

LD: Ok, we should say have a valid certificate

AY: Maybe TD's

AJ: Who looks after this?

LD: Memberships

AY: And events for sanctioning

AJ: Timeline?

LD: Have everything written up for the next meeting

AY: When do we want to publish the events document?

LD: Wait till next meeting when we have more done. Can release in bulk

KC: Gameplay and events should be released at the same time



General Business

AJ: We talked about quarterly financial reports. It is at the quarter of the year.

LD: Nicola can you action this?

NG: Yes, if we release a financial report we might get a number of people asking about memberships, what are we going to answer this? We will start up when we can, you can have a refund if you want?

AJ: Yes, say we are monitoring the situation

KC: Or allowing memberships to roll over

Meeting Closed: 7:50pm